

In the United States Court of Federal Claims
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS
No. 24-833V

LOUIS QUICK,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: April 23, 2025

Timothy James Lessman, Knutson & Casey Law Firm, Mankato, MN, for Petitioner.

Ryan Pohlman Miller, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On May 30, 2024, Louis Quick filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that he suffered a Table injury – shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of his November 21, 2022 tetanus diphtheria acellular pertussis (“Tdap”) vaccination. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that he received his vaccination in the United States, that he suffered the residual effects of his injury for more than six months, and that there has been no prior award or settlement of a civil action on his behalf as a result of his injury. See Petition at ¶¶ 4, 13-14. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

On April 21, 2025, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Damages in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Damages at 1, ECF No. 20. Specifically, Respondent states that the Division of Injury Compensation Programs, Department of Health and Human Services ("DICP") has

reviewed the petition and medical records filed in this case and has concluded that compensation is appropriate. DICP has concluded that petitioner's alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA as defined by the Vaccine Injury Table. Specifically, petitioner had no history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of his right shoulder prior to vaccination; pain occurred within forty-eight hours after receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; pain and reduced range of motion was limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered; and no other condition or abnormality has been identified to explain petitioner's shoulder pain. 42 C.F.R. §§ 100.3(a), (c)(10). Additionally, based on the medical records outlined above, petitioner suffered the residual effects of his condition for more than six months. Therefore, based on the record as it now stands, petitioner has satisfied all legal prerequisites for compensation under the Act. See 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-13(a)(1)(B); 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i).

Id. at 5.

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master